



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/786,674

02/25/2004

Marc Shapiro

MS1-1730US

3021

22971

7590

08/24/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT

ONE MICROSOFT WAY

REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER

MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,674

Applicant(s)

SHAPIRO ET AL.

Examiner

Jay A. Morrison

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/21/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-48 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. As per claim 16, line 1: "the second computer-related source" should be "the first computer-related source". (note: claims 15 and 16 are identical)Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7-12,24-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7-12 and 24-29 each recite the limitation "the recorded action of the first computer-related source," respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the action of the first computer-related source".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-4,7-17,36,39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims do not recite a practical application by producing a physical transformation or producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result. To perform a physical transformation, the claimed invention must transform an article or physical object into a different state or thing. Transformation of data is not a physical transformation. A useful, concrete, and tangible result must be either specifically recited in the claim or flow inherently therefrom. To be useful the claimed invention must establish a specific, substantial, and credible utility. To be concrete the claimed invention must be able to produce the same results given the same initial starting conditions. To be tangible the claimed invention must produce a practical application or real world result. In this case the claims fail to perform a physical transformation because the claims are directed to operating on data. The claims are useful and concrete, but they fail to product a tangible result because the result is not stored in a non-volatile medium or, for example, reported to a user.

6. Claims 18-34,37,40 recites "a computer program product", which is defined on page 3 of the specification of the invention as including a carrier wave. Because carrier waves, being a form of electromagnetic energy, do not fall into one of the statutory categories of 35 U.S.C. 101, the claim includes non-statutory subject matter. A detailed

Art Unit: 2168

explanation describing why carrier waves are regarded as non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101 follows:

Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101.

First, a claimed signal is clearly not a "process" under § 101 because it is not a series of steps. The other three § 101 classes of machine, compositions of matter and manufactures "relate to structural entities and can be grouped as 'product' claims in order to contrast them with process claims." 1 D. Chisum, Patents § 1.02 (1994). The three product classes have traditionally required physical structure or material.

"The term machine includes every mechanical device or combination of mechanical device or combination of mechanical powers and devices to perform some function and produce a certain effect or result." Corning v. Burden, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 252, 267 (1854). A modern definition of machine would no doubt include electronic devices which perform functions. Indeed, devices such as flip-flops and computers are referred to in computer science as sequential machines. A claimed signal has no physical structure, does not itself perform any useful, concrete and tangible result and, thus, does not fit within the definition of a machine.

A "composition of matter" "covers all compositions of two or more substances and includes all composite articles, whether they be results of chemical union, or of mechanical mixture, or whether they be gases, fluids, powders or solids." Shell Development Co. v. Watson, 149 F. Supp. 279, 280, 113 USPQ 265, 266 (D.D.C. 1957), *aff'd*, 252 F.2d 861, 116 USPQ 428 (D.C. Cir. 1958). A claimed signal is not matter, but a form of energy, and therefore is not a composition of matter.

The Supreme Court has read the term "manufacture" in accordance with its dictionary definition to mean "the production of articles for use from raw or prepared materials by giving to these materials new forms, qualities, properties, or combinations, whether by hand-labor or by machinery." *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 308, 206 USPQ 193, 196-97 (1980) (quoting *American Fruit Growers, Inc. v. Brogdex Co.*, 283 U.S. 1, 11, 8 USPQ 131, 133 (1931), which, in turn, quotes the Century Dictionary). Other courts have applied similar definitions. See *American Disappearing Bed Co. v. Arnaelsteen*, 182 F. 324, 325 (9th Cir. 1910), *cert. denied*, 220 U.S. 622 (1911). These definitions require physical substance, which a claimed signal does not have. Congress can be presumed to be aware of an administrative or judicial interpretation of a statute and to adopt that interpretation when it re-enacts a statute without change. *Lorillard v. Pons*, 434 U.S. 575, 580 (1978). Thus,

Art Unit: 2168

Congress must be presumed to have been aware of the interpretation of manufacture in American Fruit Growers when it passed the 1952 Patent Act.

A manufacture is also defined as the residual class of product. 1 Chisum, § 1.02[3] (citing W. Robinson, The Law of Patents for Useful Inventions 270 (1890)).

A product is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a signal is not. That the other two product classes, machine and composition of matter, require physical matter is evidence that a manufacture was also intended to require physical matter. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the two definitions of manufacture. Thus, a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of § 101.

7. As per claims 35,38,41, these claims disclose a system but do not describe any hardware which is required for a system claim to be statutory. Accordingly, these system claims are rejected as non-statutory for failing to disclose any hardware.

8. As per claims 43-48, the cited claims do not produce a tangible result. Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure

Art Unit: 2168

and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. In addition, claims that do not in any way make tangible any results are also not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-4,7,13-14,17-21,24,30-31,33-41,43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479).

As per claim 1, Mellen-Garnett teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract)

recording action information pertaining to an action of a first computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded action of a second computer-related source; (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

executing an action management operation on the action of the first computer-related source and the recorded action of the second computer-related source.

(collaboration module, paragraph [0041],[0043])

As per claim 2, Mellen-Garnett teaches

registering the first computer-related source with an action management module that receives action information about actions associated with multiple computer-related sources. (paragraph [0043])

As per claim 3, Mellen-Garnett teaches

registering the second computer-related source with an action management module that receives action information about actions associated with multiple computer-related sources. (paragraph [0043])

As per claim 4, Mellen-Garnett teaches

detecting selection of the recorded action of the first computer-related source from a plurality of recorded actions of the first computer-related source and the second computer-related source. (paragraph [0041],[0043])

As per claim 7, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to undo the recorded action of the first computer-related source. (paragraph [0051])

As per claim 13, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the second computer-related source is an application. (paragraph [0041])

As per claim 14, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the second computer-related source is an inactive application and further comprising: executing the inactive application responsive to execution of the action management operation. (paragraph [0034])

As per claim 17, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the second computer-related source is a computer process. (paragraph [0033])

As per claims 18-21,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-4 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 24,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected.

As per claims 30-31,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 13-14 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 33, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the second computer-related source is an inactive document and the computer process further comprises: executing an application on the inactive document responsive to execution of the action management operation. (paragraph [0034])

As per claim 34,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 35,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 36, Mellen-Garnett teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract)

recording action information for one or more logical actions of a first computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded logical action of a second computer-related source. (collaboration module, paragraph [0041],[0043])

As per claim 37,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 36 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 38,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 36 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 39, Mellen-Garnett teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract)

registering a first computer-related source with an action management module;
(collaboration module, paragraph [0043])

registering a second computer-related source with the action management module; (collaboration module, paragraph [0043])

and recording action information relating to an action of the first computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded action of a second source. (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

As per claim 40,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 39 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 41, Mellen-Garnett teaches

A system comprising: (see abstract)

an action management module registering a first computer-related source with an action management module and registering a second computer-related source with the action management module; (collaboration module, paragraph [0043])

and an action log recording action information relating to an action of the first computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded action of a second source. (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

As per claim 43, Mellen-Garnett teaches

One or more computer-readable media storing a data structure comprising: (see abstract)

a first data field storing an action identifier for a primary action; (storage, paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

a second data field storing a source identifier for a first computer-related source associated with the action identifier; (storage, paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

a third data field storing a related action identifier for a related action; (storage, paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

and a fourth data field storing a source identifier for a second computer-related source associated with the related action identifier. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 44, Mellen-Garnett teaches

a fifth field storing a relationship descriptor specifying the relationship between the primary action and the related action. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 45, Mellen-Garnett teaches

a fifth field storing a container action identifier identifying a container action containing the primary action within the action hierarchy. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 46, Mellen-Garnett teaches

a fifth field storing a component action identifier identifying a component action contained by the primary action within the action hierarchy. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 47, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the data structure is recorded in an action log and further comprising: a fifth field storing an inactive flag indicating that the primary action has been made inactive but the data structure remains persistent the action log. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 48, Mellen-Garnett teaches

a fifth field storing an action descriptor describing the primary action. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 5-6,15-16,22-23,32,42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of De Meno et al. ('De Meno' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,721,767).

Art Unit: 2168

As per claim 5, Mellen-Garnett teaches

of the first computer-related source and the second computer-related source in accordance with causal relationships among the recorded actions. (paragraph [0034])

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “displaying recorded actions”

However, De Meno discloses “displaying recorded actions” (figure 4; column 5, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps of “displaying recorded actions” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claim 6, Mellen-Garnett teaches

of the first computer-related source and the second computer-related source in accordance with chronological relationships among the recorded actions. (paragraph [0034])

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “displaying recorded actions”

However, De Meno discloses “displaying recorded actions” (figure 4; column 5, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps

Art Unit: 2168

of “displaying recorded actions” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claim 15,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “the second computer-related source is a document object.”

However, De Meno discloses “the second computer-related source is a document object” (column 3, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps of “the second computer-related source is a document object” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claim 16,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “the second computer-related source is a document object.”

However, De Meno discloses “the second computer-related source is a document object” (column 3, lines 1-10).

Art Unit: 2168

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps of "the second computer-related source is a document object" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claims 22-23,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 5-6 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 32,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 42, Mellen-Garnett teaches

A method in a computer system for displaying on a display device logical actions of a first computer-related source and a second computer-related source, the method comprising: (see abstract)

receiving a reference to an action of a first computer-related source and an associated relationship with an action of a second computer-related source; (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

of the action of a first computer-related source and a representation of the action of a second computer-related source; (paragraph [0034])

of a relationship between the action of a first computer-related source and the action of a first computer-related source. (paragraph [0034])

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "displaying a representation".

De Meno discloses "displaying a representation" (figure 4; column 5, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps of "displaying a representation" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

13. Claims 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nainani et al. ('Nainani' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,185,577).

As per claim 8,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to redo the recorded action of the first computer-related source."

However, Nainani discloses "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to redo the recorded action of the first computer-related source." (column 8, lines 6-18)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Nainani because using the steps of "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to redo the recorded action of the first computer-related source" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by roll forward changes after data is recovered. This gives the user the advantage of not losing changes and being able to reset the state of data.

As per claim 25,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected.

14. Claims 9-12,26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellèn-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Multer et al. ('Multer' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,925,476).

As per claim 9,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action.”

However, Multer discloses “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action” (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and no have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 10,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of a different action type.”

However, Multer discloses “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of a different action type” (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of a different action type” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and not have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 11,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of the same action type having different action parameters.”

However, Multer discloses “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of the same action type having different action parameters” (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of the same action type having different action parameters” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and no have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 12,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with multiple actions.”

However, Multer discloses “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with multiple actions” (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of “the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management

Art Unit: 2168

facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with multiple actions" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and no have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 26-29,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 9-12 and are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100



Tim Vo
TC2100